Determinants of Employee Volunteer Intention: An Empirical Study on Functional Motivation Theory

Ericka Chua, Marika Chuateco, Leise Mangune, Jannine Shen, Patrick Adriel H. Aure

Management and Organization Department, Ramon V. del Rosario College of Business, De La Salle University, Phillipines

Abstract
Employee participation plays an important role in the success of corporate social responsibility programmes, but there are limited studies that understand the drivers of employee volunteerism in the Philippines. Clary and Snyder's functional motivation theory was drawn upon in determining the six kinds of volunteer motivations in this study conducted on employees from Pilipinas Shell Petroleum Corporation and SM Investment Corporation. The respondents were divided by gender, age group, and volunteer experience to see whether these factors would significantly affect motivation; only volunteer experience emerged as significant in the findings. Another interesting finding is that employees are more inspired to volunteer when they can learn something new, and furthermore that women are more motivated by the social motive than men and are thus more likely to volunteer when their friends do so.

Background of the Study

"Corporate social responsibility (CSR) and employee engagement are two of the most discussed issues in the business world today" (Gross & Holland, 2011, p. 1). Zedeck (2011) defines CSR as actions that cater to stakeholders' expectations and fulfill the company's triple bottom line, while McGlone et al. (2011) contend that CSR has been advocated by millennials. On the other hand, employee engagement is defined by Jun & Seng (2016) as an employee's belief in the organization and its values, and an employee's willingness to help the organization succeed. From this context, CSR can be seen as pivotal in cultivating employee engagement and strengthening company morale. Furthermore, CSR can be internalized and manifested on an individual level when employees engage in volunteerism.

Employee motivations in volunteering are a crucial part of developing and sustaining CSR strategies (Cycyota, et al., 2016; Grant, 2012). Hendricks & Curtler (2004) state that different people have different motives for volunteering; moreover, a person's motives may differ throughout his/her life cycle. Güntert et al., (2016) discuss that in assessing the quality of volunteers' motivations, functional and self-determination approaches can be utilized.

Although volunteerism is still relevant in modern times, older work has discussed the drivers of volunteerism in both nonprofit and corporate contexts. Motivation in volunteering can

be defined as the willingness people have to work without getting paid for it (Riecken et al., 1994). It is considered the driving force which explains why people participate and put effort in these activities. To be motivated can be defined as to be moved to accomplish certain tasks that impact the focus, vigor and tenacity of a person's behaviour (Campbell, 1975). The functional motivation theory proposed by Clary and Snyder (1999) also highlights the varying motivations that propel one to engage in volunteer work. According to Clary and Snyder (1999) there are six motivational factors that propel one to volunteer namely, values, understanding, enhancement, career, social, and protective motive. These six functions are the framework of the functional motivation theory. Linking this with CSR, the different motivations above also correspond to different forms of CSR initiatives. Using Clary and Snyder's functional motivation theory (1999), the researchers aim to determine the impact of each of the six motivational functions in propelling volunteerism among the employees of a company. This study was conducted on selected employees from Pilipinas Shell Petroleum Company (PSPC) and SM Investments Corporation (SM) to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the significant motivational functions of employee intention to volunteer?

RQ2: Which function has the highest significance in motivating employees to engage in volunteer work?

RQ3: Does the highest motivational function differ among these groups?
   a. With prior volunteer experience and without prior volunteer experience
   b. Men and women
   c. Generation X and millennials

Review of Related Literature
Employees who have the opportunities to make social or environmental impact are more satisfied with their work than those who do not (Szeltner, 2012; Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008; Batson et al., 2002). Jun & Seng (2016) further add that social responsibility can give employees a sense of belongingness and obligation to the company. One way for companies to give their employees the opportunity to make a social impact is through Corporate Social Responsibility. "Specifically, CSR is most effective when employees play the role of the actual enactor of CSR programmes with the company acting as an enabler" (Jun & Seng, 2016, p. 915).

It is important to look into various theories and perspectives regarding the motivations of employees in terms of volunteerism. Motivation is essentially linked to performance and the motivational theories attempt to explain this link (Gibson et al., 2011). Putting this in the context of volunteerism, different methods of sorting and different theories have emerged as a way to assess volunteer engagement. Hartenian and Lily (2009) discuss that in understanding sustained volunteering, it is important to look at egoistic and commitment-oriented drivers of employees. On the other hand, Jones (2010) contends that volunteerism should be looked at through the lens of organizational identification and social exchange theories. Lai et al., (2012) support the notion that motivation is a crucial link in understanding intention to volunteer and national identity contexts.

"Presently, the functional theory of motivation to volunteer is the most important approach to understanding motivation to volunteer" (Davila & Diaz-Morales, 2009, p. 82). The functional approach is a motivational perception that links inquiry to an individual's action (Katz, 1960). It proposes the idea that individuals perform the same action but with different psychological functions, and suggests that different motivational levels affect the sustainability of the individual's actions through time (Clary et al., 1996). The authors link the functional approach to volunteerism by emphasizing that a group of volunteers may do the same activity but have different motives from one individual to the other.

As such, Clary et al., (1992) evaluated almost 1,000 volunteers from a variety of community engagement directives using an instrument that assesses how each of the six functions is fulfilled by volunteering, which they named the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI). Several scholars, including the authors' colleagues, have conducted studies based on the VFI and the multidimensional model of motives for over a decade since the original study (Clary et al., 1994; Clary, Snyder & Stukas, 1996; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Snyder, Clary & Stukas, 2000; Stukas, Clary & Snyder 1999). The VFI was a result of years of research on a variety of volunteers, and each item in the questionnaire had been perfected through constant testing. Moreover, Okun et al., (1998) also state that the VFI was found to be superior to other forms of instruments as it tackles multiple functions that unidimensional or two-dimensional functional approaches are unable to assess. Table 1 shows a summary of the Clary and Snyder's (1999) six motivational functions and a sample question that corresponds to each function.

Table 1

Drivers of employee volunteerism

Drivers	Overview
Values	Volunteerism is driven by one's desire to express or act on important values
Understanding	Volunteerism is driven by one's desire to learn and understand more about the world
Enhancement	Volunteerism is driven by one's desire to enhance one's self and develop psychologically through volunteer activities.
Career	Volunteerism is driven by one's desire to gain relevant career-related experience.
Social	Volunteerism is driven by one's desire to strengthen one's social relationships.
Protective	Volunteerism is driven by one's desire to reduce personal negative feelings or alleviate one's personal problems.

Source: Modified from Clary & Snyder, 1999

Using the VFI, Brayley et al. (2014) found that career and values constitute greatly to the older population's desire to volunteer. Moreover, older volunteers were found to give greater importance to social motives, while giving less importance to understanding and career motives (Okun & Schultz, 2003). In contrast to that, younger volunteers were seen to have a higher tendency of volunteering when they perceive it as a career stimulator (Clary & Snyder, 1999). Another study conducted by Papadakis et al. (2004) found differences between respondents who had volunteered and those who had not. Those who have volunteered give the greatest importance to values over understanding, while those who have not volunteered give the greatest importance to career over values (Papadakis et al., 2004). Gender also plays a big part in defining motivation, as research suggests that volunteering is gender specific. Women are said to be more inclined to volunteer (Bussel & Forbes, 2002).

Findings in Papadakis et al (2004) study suggests that men find career to be the most significant motive, followed by values, while women see values as most significant, followed by understanding. On the other hand, a 2004 study by Esmond showed that men are slightly less motivated by the career function compared with women; no significant difference could be found on the other motivational functions. The clashing motives of respondents from past research are mainly values, career, and understanding. Variances are also found between age, gender and prior volunteer experience; thus it is important to properly assess employee motives in volunteerism.

Theoretical, Conceptual and Operational Framework

Theoretical Framework

"The functional motivation theory was derived from theories concerning attitude and persuasion" (Widjaja, 2010, p. 9). This theory revolves around two principles; one is the assumption that people have goals wherein they engage in activities full of purpose to achieve them, and the other is the assumption that people may do the same things, but have varying reasons for doing so (Clary et al., 1998). It is deeply rooted in the belief that people are driven and ambitious in nature, and they have an altruistic aspect to them. Moreover, Davila and Diaz-Morales (2009) note that the functional motivation theory was designed by Clary and Snyder (1999) "to explain the different types of motives that can determine participation in volunteer services" (p. 82).

The theory assumes that employees volunteer to fulfill a certain goal or to attain a certain psychological need; however, this psychological need differs from person to person. Clary and Snyder (1999) also state that this theory connotes that people will participate in volunteer work and continue to do so as long as it is in line with their psychological need. On that note, this theory becomes a very useful tool in determining how to attract employees to volunteer in the company's CSR programmes by knowing which among the six motivational functions the employees give more importance to.

Conceptual Framework

The present research is anchored by Clary et al., (1992) six functional approaches in gauging the level of motivation that propels employees to volunteer. These six distinct motivational factors were defined in Clary et al.'s multi-dimensional model of motivation as values, understanding,

enhancement, career, social and protective. Using the Functional Motivation Theory as the backbone of Clary et al.'s (1992) concept, the model assumes that people generally have a sense of purpose, and that people may be doing the same activity with different reasons or goals in mind (Clary et al., 1998). That being said, the framework connects the six psychological motivations with desire to volunteer and acting upon that desire to fulfill one's psychological needs. The researchers used Clary and Snyder's (1999) definitions on the six volunteer motives for the operational framework. Each motive corresponds to a specific psychological need that one seeks to fulfill, and this psychological need is what propels one to do volunteer work.

Methodology

The researchers chose two of the largest companies in the Philippines who were recognized for their CSR programmes namely: SM Investments Corporation and Pilipinas Shell Petroleum Corporation. SM Investments Corporation has won numerous awards for their CSR programmes, namely, the 9th Annual Global Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Summit & Awards in 2017, and Corporate Governance Asia - 6th Asian Excellence Awards in 2016. Pilipinas Shell Petroleum has also bagged a lot of CSR awards. Some of these are for their Integrated Support for Indigenous People Program in 2017, and the KAPATID Awards by the Employers Confederation of the Philippines (ECOP). Since these companies were awarded for their CSR programmes, they were thought to be a good representation for this study.

   The authors chose well known corporations because they believe that successful corporations have the capacity to conduct relevant CSR programmes. Since the research is about volunteerism, the chosen companies should have CSR programmes that encourage employees through volunteerism. Moreover, the chosen companies were required to be based in the Philippines. Part of the criteria in purposive sampling was that the employees must have worked with the company for at least one year to give them enough time to join and /or learn about the CSR programmes of the company.

   The instrument used was the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI), which assesses the six motives (Clary & Snyder, 1999). The first part of the questionnaire included socio-demographic questions namely age, company, department, gender, and prior volunteerism experience. The second part of the questionnaire comprised of 30 questions each corresponding to one of the six scales of the Volunteer Functions Inventory namely Values, Understanding, Career, Social, Enhancement and Protective (Clary & Snyder, 1999). Respondents were asked to rate the six scale from 1 to 7 with 1 being not important/not accurate for them and 7 being the most important/accurate for them. An answer from 1 to 3 would mean not important, 4 would mean neutral and 5 to 7 would mean that it is important. Surveys were manually handed out to the chosen employees or Google form links were shared depending on the company's preference.

   An a priori sample size calculator for multiple regression was used by the researchers (Roper, D., (n.d.). *Calculator: A-priori Sample Size for Multiple Regression.* Free Statistics Calculators 4.0 https://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc/calculator.aspx?id=1). With an assumption of an anticipated effect size (f^2) at least 0.2 (roughly equivalent to anticipating at least a medium effect size), a desired statistical power level of 0.8, a desired probability level of 0.05, and a maximum of nine predictors (six motivational functions plus age and gender as control variables)

in a regression equation, the minimum required sample size for each company is 87. This is met by the study.

This study utilized Cronbach's alpha to determine how consistent the six motives are with each other. Apart from that, the respondents were divided into three sets: employees with and without prior volunteer experience, men and women, generation x and millennials; a separate analysis was also done on companies individually. To find out which of the six functional motivations is most important to each group, their mean scores was computed; the motivation with the highest mean score was considered the most important for that group, while the motivation with the lowest score was considered least important. A "t-test is used in determining the statistical significance of a sample distribution mean and a parameter" (Cooper & Schindler, 2014, p. 444). To test this study's hypothesis, a t-test was done to determine the difference between the groups, and significance of their differences. Multiple regression was also used to find the association between gender, age, and prior volunteer work with the six motivations.

Data and Results

Using Google Forms and survey printouts, a total of 201 respondents was gathered, comprising 99 respondents from PSPC and 102 respondents of SM. The majority of the respondents were millennials. More than half of the individuals surveyed were women and had prior experience with volunteerism.

Table 2
Respondents Profile

Profile		PSPC		SM		Total	
Company		99	49%	102	51%	201	100%
Age	Millennials	70	54%	59	46%	129	64%
	Generation X	21	43%	28	57%	49	24%
	Others	8	35%	15	65%	23	12%
Gender	Female	59	48%	63	52%	122	61%
	Male	40	51%	39	49%	79	39%
Volunteer Experience	With Prior Experience	68	60%	46	40%	114	57%
	Without Prior Experience	28	37%	47	63%	75	37%
	Not indicated	3	25%	9	75%	12	6%

Source: Author's own

Based on the tests done below, Understanding was consistently significant for the groups, total respondents, PSPC and SM employees, while Career was only significantly and negatively correlated to intent among the groups, total respondents and the PSPC employees. Although the focus of this segment is the total respondent results, minor variances in the two companies mentioned above are also discussed. Gender and age did not make any substantial difference to

the level of importance given to the six motivations, but prior volunteer experience did have a significant influence on motives and intention. In terms of ranking, Values was given the highest score, while Career was given the lowest for almost all groups.

Table 3
Mean Scores of VFI and Intention to Volunteer

Variables	Mean Scores based on 1-7 Likert scales		Grand Mean Scores	Cron-bach's Alpha
	PSPC	SM		
Intention to Volunteer	5.32	5.43	5.38	0.90
I intend to do volunteer work in the coming months.				
*I am not willing to participate in volunteer work.**				
VFI Values	5.78	5.66	5.72	0.62
I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.				
I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.				
I feel compassion towards people in need.				
I feel it is important to help others.				
I can do something for a cause that is important to me.				
VFI Understanding	5.71	5.64	5.68	0.63
I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.				
Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.				
Volunteering lets me learn things through direct, hands-on experience.				
I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.				
I can explore my own strengths.				
VFI Enhancement	5.32	5.39	5.36	0.71
Volunteering makes me feel important.				
Volunteering increases my self- esteem.				
Volunteering makes me feel needed.				
Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.				
Volunteering is a way to make new friends.				
VFI Social	5.08	5.09	5.08	0.65
My friends volunteer.				
People I'm close to want me to volunteer.				
People I know share an interest in community service.				
Others with whom I am close with place a high value on community service.				
Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.				

VFI Protective	4.94	4.8 1	4.87	0.76

No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me forget about it.
By volunteering, I feel less lonely.
Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.
Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.
Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.

VFI Career	4.93	4.7 4	4.83	0.75

Volunteering can help me get my foot out the door at a place where I would like to work in.
I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.
Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.
Volunteering will help me to succeed in my chosen profession.
Volunteer experience will look good on my resume.

Source: Author's own

The results of the t-test show that prior volunteer experience has significant influence on employees' intention to volunteer. Employees who have volunteered before are more inclined to volunteer again, especially when their motives are fulfilled. Apart from Career, those with and without prior experience do not place the same level of importance on the other five VFI motives; a significant difference was found. The findings of this study are consistent with the findings of Papadakis et al. (2004) as Understanding and Values ranked top for volunteers, and Enhancement ranked in between for both groups. The present study and Papadakis et al.'s (2004) study both indicate that there was a significant difference between Understanding for volunteers and non-volunteers.

Table 4
Sum values and t-test results of employees with and without prior volunteer experience

Variables	PSPC			SM			Total		
	Without Expe-ri ence	With Expe -rien ce	P-Valu e	Without Expe-rie nce	With Expe-ri ence	P-Valu e	Without Expe-rie nce	With Expe-r ience	P-Valu e
Career	23.9	24.8	0.497	22.6	23.8	0.351	23.1	24.4	0.146
Social	23.2	26.2	0.011	23.5	26.8	0.004	23.4	26.4	< .001
Values	27.1	29.7	0.003	26.8	29.5	0.010	26.9	29.6	< .001
Understandin g	26.6	29.3	0.006	26.6	29.3	0.029	26.6	29.3	< .001
Enhancement	24.9	27.1	0.106	24.9	28.3	0.010	24.9	27.6	0.003
Protective	21.9	25.7	0.009	21.9	25.7	0.009	21.9	25.7	< .001

Source: Author's own

Based on the regression analysis on PSPC employees, the Social motive has a positive influence on women; thus, they are more likely to volunteer when they are invited by their friends. The t-test further supports this claim as women give significantly greater importance to

the Social motive than men. One possible explanation to this is that women are more inclined to volunteer than men (Bussell & Forbes, 2002). Furthermore, women have the tendency of tackling challenges in groups. The other five motives were not significant; hence, gender is not an important classification in determining the motives of volunteerism. Consistent with past research, such as Clary et al.'s (1998) study, the t-test shows that both genders assign the same level of importance to each motivation.

Table 5
Sum values and t-test results of female and male employees

Variables	PSPC			SM			Total		
	Female	Male	P-Value	Female	Male	P-Value	Female	Male	P-Value
Career	24.9	24.3	0.670	23.2	24.2	0.433	24.0	24.3	0.779
Social	26.6	23.6	0.008	25.3	25.6	0.785	25.9	24.6	0.097
Values	29.4	28.3	0.200	27.8	29.1	0.214	28.6	28.7	0.875
Understanding	28.9	28.1	0.399	28.0	28.5	0.646	28.4	28.3	0.874
Enhancement	27.0	26.0	0.402	27.0	26.9	0.979	27.0	26.5	0.546
Protective	25.2	23.9	0.307	24.0	24.2	0.886	24.6	24.0	0.568

Source: Author's own

Based on the regression analysis, there is no strong relationship in the motivations of the respondents among the two age groups. However, the t-test shows that Career and Protective motives have been given significantly different levels of importance by generation x and millennials. Gonzalez (2009), who had also adopted the VFI motives in their study on tutoring programme volunteers found that younger volunteers exhibited higher levels of Career and Understanding motivations. Similarly, Okun and Schultz (2003) discovered that younger volunteers gave more importance to the Career motive. In this study, Values was given the highest score by both generation x and millennials, while Career was given the second lowest score. This is supported by Davila and Diaz-Morales's (2009) study where respondents of all age groups scored the Values motive the highest, and Career motive low.

Table 6
Sum values and t-test results of employees in Generation X and Millennials

Variables	PSPC			SM			Total		
	Generation X	Millennials	P-Value	Generation X	Millennials	P-Value	Generation X	Millennials	P-Value
Career	23.0	25.2	0.119	22.5	24.1	0.264	22.7	24.7	0.045
Social	25.5	25.4	0.953	24.2	25.9	0.163	24.8	25.6	0.317
Values	29.1	28.9	0.851	27.8	28.5	0.525	28.3	28.7	0.607
Understanding	28.9	28.6	0.812	27.1	28.6	0.252	27.9	28.6	0.381
Enhancement	26.7	26.5	0.887	25.4	27.0	0.082	26.0	27.1	0.253

Protective	23.2	25.4	0.167	22.3	24.8	0.110	22.7	25.1	0.027

Source: Author's own

The findings of this study are partially consistent with past research on the motivations of volunteerism. For starters, Values motivation was found to rank the highest in all age groups, (Papadakis et al., 2004; Davila & Diaz-Morales, 2009; Gage & Thapa, 2012), and it is ranked high by the respondents of this study as well. Similar to this paper, Understanding was also shown to be significantly different between genders and those with or without prior volunteer experience (Papadakis et al., 2004); it was also a strong motivation for volunteers in different programmes (Gonzalez, 2009; Gage & Thapa, 2012). However, the ranking of the Career function in this survey was found to be much lower than what past research had found it to be, especially among the younger generations. Clary and Snyder (1999) had recorded that the youth gave more importance to the Career function, and Papadakis et al.'s (2004) study had also shown the Career function as the top motivator for men, and third for women. This does not coincide with the data gathered from the respondents, as they had given the Career function the lowest mean score. Past literature also indicates that non-volunteers were more inclined to Career, but results in this study showed that there was no significant difference with Career. Some of the findings in this study are congruent to past research and some are not.

Table 7

Pearson's Correlation of Independent Variables with Volunteer Intention

Variables	PSPC		SM		Total	
	Pearson's Correlation Co-efficient	P-Value	Pearson's Correlation Co-efficient	P-Value	Pearson's Correlation Co-efficient	P-Value
Career	0.140	0.168	0.339	<.001	0.236	<.001
Social	0.495	<.001	0.495	<.001	0.493	<.001
Values	0.547	<.001	0.545	<.001	0.538	<.001
Understanding	0.490	<.001	0.650	<.001	0.579	<.001
Enhancement	0.218	0.030	0.630	<.001	0.446	<.001
Protective	0.250	0.013	0.487	<.001	0.377	<.001

Source: Author's own

Career and Understanding both significantly influence intent. Career is inversely related to intent meaning the respondents are less inclined to volunteer when the volunteer programme is centred on Career strengthening. Consistent with Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen's (1991) study, respondents scored gaining career-related experience the second lowest. This could be because people who are motivated by Career may most likely think that volunteerism is not of high priority and may devote more time towards other activities or work that would bear more weight in their career. On the other hand, Understanding is directly related to intent meaning the more a person wants to gain experience to acquire new skills, the more they have intentions to volunteer. Similarly, Gage and Thapa (2012), in a study conducted in one of the universities in Southeast United States, found that Understanding and Values were the strongest motives to volunteer.

This could be because volunteering might help the person to better understand the world and gain knowledge that would help them in their future endeavours.

Table 8
Regression Analysis Summary

Variables	PSPC	SM	Total
Age	2.580	0.024	0.023
	(0.796)	(0.860)	(0.585)
	$p = 0.626$	$p = 0.494$	$p = 0.401$
Gender	-0.579	-0.678	-0.822 (0.036)
	(0.050)	(0.052)	[-1.584, 0.075]
	$p = 0.371$	$p = 0.228$	$p = 0.061$
Prior Volunteer Experience	-0.781	1.024	0.160
	(0.047)	(0.053)	(0.036)
	$p = 0.291$	$p = 0.076$	$p = 0.726$
VFI Career	-0.181	-0.117	-0.163
	(0.605)	(0.640)	(0.441)
	$p = 0.026$	$p = 0.085$	$p = 0.002$
VFI Social	0.284	-0.091	0.097
	(0.551)	(0.579)	(0.399)
	$p = 0.005$	$p = 0.309$	$p = 0.155$
VFI Values	0.171	0.100	0.106
	(0.418)	(0.524)	(0.333)
	$p = 0.192$	$p = 0.302$	$p = 0.191$
VFI Understanding	0.333	0.307	0.370
	(0.462)	(0.621)	(0.383)
	$p = 0.005$	$p = 0.002$	$p = <\ .001$
VFI Enhancement	-0.201	0.282	0.021
	(0.611)	(0.692)	(0.459)
	$p = 0.031$	$p = 0.006$	$p = 0.766$
VFI Protective	0.070	-0.079	0.006
	(0.664)	(0.755)	(0.501)
	$p = 0.416$	$p = 0.332$	$p = 0.921$

	PSPC	SM	Total
R-squared	0.45	0.538	0.438
Adjusted R-squared	0.392	0.536	0.41
F-statistics	7.81	12.4	15.3
Model p-value	<.001	<.001	<.001
No. of Valid Observations	96	90	186

Source: Author's own

From these results and given the context of recent times, it can be seen that Understanding is the most consistent statistical predictor of intention to volunteer. This finding provides insight regarding employees as both corporate and societal citizens, since the Understanding motive is about one's desire to learn and make sense of the world beyond one's job. The findings suggest that other motivations may vary between employees, but volunteerism can be an avenue that allows employees to gain a more profound appreciation of a holistic life.

A surprising finding is the negative relationship between the "Career" motivation and the intention to volunteer. A recent context of work and employee volunteerism is perhaps that volunteerism is not about career advancement, but rather an opportunity for a person to pursue other humanistic goals. From the qualitative responses of employees, those who have high scores in terms of Career would rather dedicate more time for directly relevant work experiences than "waste time" doing volunteer work. This can potentially explain why a career-related orientation is negatively related with intentions to do volunteer work.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The researchers conclude from this study, that the six functions namely: Career, Social, Values, Understanding, Enhancement and Protective are important employee motivations to volunteer, since all motives were awarded a fairly high score. Values was given the highest score, while Career was given the lowest score. All groups regardless of their age, gender, and past volunteerism experience see Values as the most important driver of volunteerism. As for the relationship to intention to volunteer, only the Understanding motive was consistently significant and positively correlated among all the tested groups. To put it simply, employees may find a stronger affinity with Values, but the Understanding motive has a greater influence on their likelihood of volunteering.

Perhaps a volunteer must be able to understand or know more about what they are doing before they can align their volunteer work with their Values. A volunteer must first learn and understand a certain cause at a deeper level so that they are aware of the best way to help in a particular situation. Companies should organize volunteer programme that can satisfy their employees' Understanding motivations. Days of service and community development were the two most recommended programmes by the respondents. Through these programmes, volunteers may learn more about the cause through direct, hands-on experience, gain a new perspective on things, and learn how to deal with different people.

Groups PSPC and SM showed slightly different results from those of the total respondents, so analyses specific to their companies were derived. This is possible due to the fact that both companies offer a different set of volunteer programmes e.g., PSPC, being in the petroleum industry, focuses more on environmental issues while SM, through SM Cares and SM Foundation, focuses more on the needs of the underprivileged such as the elderly, handicapped, and children. As such, PSPC employees tend to prefer volunteering when they are joined by friends, and they do not seek self-validation from volunteering. SM employees find motivations from proving their self-worth, which may be because they find greater pleasure in helping the marginalized through SM volunteer programmes. Upon testing the age, gender, and prior volunteer experience of the employees, only the latter had a significant correlation with intention to volunteer. Conceivably, those who volunteered before may have had a positive experience that may have influenced them to take another opportunity to volunteer. For others, having prior volunteer experience could provide the comfort of knowing what they will go through in a volunteering experience.

Table 9
Summary of Research Questions and Results

Research Questions	Summary of Results
1. What are the motivational functions that the employees consider significant and not significant in motivating them to engage in volunteer work?	Understanding and Career have a statistically significant influence on volunteer intention
2. Which function has the most significance in motivating employees to engage in volunteer work?	The function with the most consistent significance is Understanding.
3. Does the highest motivational function differ among these groups?	
A. With prior volunteer experience and without prior volunteer experience	A. Highest motivational function is Values for both, but they have statistically significant difference.
B. Men and women	B. Highest motivational function is Values, however on a gender level basis, the result is not found to be statistically significant.
C. Generation X and millennials	C. Highest motivational function is Values, however on a generation level basis, the result is not found to be statistically significant.
4. What types of employee engagement CSR initiatives match the motivational functions that employees find most significant?	Programmes that satisfy Understanding motives (Days of service or community development initiatives).

Source: Author's own

Further research can also include other variables, such as perception of the availability of time. Also researchers can look at the treatment of the Six Functional Motives as mediators.

The researchers would like to suggest the following recommendations to each relevant stakeholder of this study:

1. For researchers, especially in developing countries: This research found some quantitative empirical evidences on the drivers of employee intention to volunteer. However, given the rich cultural context of developing countries as well as the complex motivations of individuals to engage in volunteerism, the researchers recommend a more qualitative approach. Capturing rich responses can build on the limitations of this research project.

2. Companies with corporate social responsibility initiatives and volunteer programmes: Volunteer experience directly influences a person's intention to volunteer. It is important that employees have a prior volunteer experience so that they are more inclined to volunteer in the programmes launched. Embedding CSR programmes into onboarding and perpetual training could give employees a positive experience that may make them want to volunteer again. To address the Understanding motive of employees, the companies must promote volunteer programmes by allowing volunteers to immerse themselves in a beneficiary or a cause that interests them. Employees should be oriented on how hands-on they will be through the volunteer experience. It would also increase participation if their volunteer programmes are able to fulfill the employees' Understanding motives; days of service and community development initiatives were seen to have the most number of suggestions.

3. Employees: They should be aware of the projects/volunteer programmes the company offers and be willing to try out the volunteer programmes they are not accustomed to, so that they can widen their perspective of what motivates them to volunteer and find out what cause(s) they really care about.

4. Academic institutions: Prior experience plays a vital role in a person's intention to volunteer. As colleges and universities train the future generation of business leaders, students should undergo training not only inside the classroom but also be involved in programmes that involve volunteering in various fields of charity work.

5. Non-profit organizations: Tying up with companies can be beneficial to the non-profit organization in gaining more volunteers, as well as coming up with programmes that centre around the six functional motivations especially Understanding and Values. More people may then be interested in joining the organization.

References

Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29(2), 147-154.

Batson, C. D., Ahmad, N., & Tsang, J. (2002). Four motives for community involvement. Journal of Social Issues, 58(3), 429-445. doi:10.1111/1540-4560.00269

Brayley, N., Obst, P. L., White, K. M., Lewis, I. M., Warburton, J., & Spencer, N. M. (2014). Examining the predictive value of combining the theory of planned behaviour and the volunteer functions inventory. Australian Journal of Psychology, 67(3), 149-156. doi:10.1111/ajpy.12078

Bussell, H., & Forbes, D. (2002). Understanding the volunteer market: The what, where, whoand why of volunteering. International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 7, 244–257.

Campbell, D. T. (1975). On the conflicts between biological and social evolution and between psychology and moral tradition. American Psychologist, 30, 1103–1126.

Clary, E. & Synder, M. (1999). The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. Retrieved from http://move.org.sg/web/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/The-Motivations-to-Volunteer-Clary-and-Snyder-1999.pdf

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Ridge, R. (1992). Volunteers' motivations: A functional strategy for the recruitment, placement, and retention of volunteers. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 2(4), 333-350. doi:10.1002/nml.4130020403

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(6), 1516-1530.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Miene, P., & Haugen, J. (1994). Matching messages to motives in persuasion: A functional approach to promoting volunteerism. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24, 1129-1149.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Stukas, A. A. (1996). Volunteer's motivations: Findings from a national survey. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 25, 485–505.

Cnaan, R. A., & Goldberg-Glen, R. S. (1991). Measuring Motivation to Volunteer in Human Services. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 27(3), 269–284. doi:10.1177/0021886391273003

Cooper, D. & Schindler, P. (2014). Business research methods. 12th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Cycyota, C. S., Ferrante, C. J., & Schroeder, J. M. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and employee volunteerism: What do the best companies do? Business Horizons, 59(3), 321-329. doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2016.01.004

Davila, M. C., & Diaz-Morales, J. F. (2009). Age and motives for volunteering: Further evidence. Europe's Journal of Psychology, 2, 82-95.

Esmond, J. (2004). Developing the volunteer motivation inventory to assess the underlying motivational drives of volunteers in Western Australia. Retrieved from CLAN WA website: https://volunteer.ca/content/clan-wa-inc-developing-volunteer-motivation-inventory-assess-underlying-motivational-drives

Gage, R. L., & Thapa, B. (2012). Volunteer motivations and constraints among college students: Analysis of the volunteer function inventory and leisure constraints models. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 41(3) 405-430.

Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnelly, J. J., & Konopaske, R. (2011). Organizations: Behavior, structure, processes. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gonzalez, K. (2009). Volunteer motivations and satisfaction in a tutoring programme: Implications for recruitment and retention. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/305065272?accountid=190474

Grant, A. (2012). Giving time, time after time: Work design and sustained employee participation in corporate volunteering. Academy of Management Review, 37(4), 589—615.

Gross, R., & Holland, B. (2011). Corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: Making the connection. White Paper. Retrieved from https://www.charities.org/sites/default/files/corporate_responsibility_white_paper%20copy.pdf

Güntert, S. T., Strubel, I. T., Kals, E., & Wehner, T. (2016). The quality of volunteers' motives: Integrating the functional approach and self-determination theory. The Journal of Social Psychology, 156(3), 310-327. doi:10.1080/00224545.2015.1135864

Hartenian, L. S., & Lily, B. (2009). Egoism and commitment: A multidimensional approach to understanding sustained volunteering. Journal of Managerial Issues, 21(1), 97-118.

Hendricks, J. & Curtler, S.J. (2004). Volunteerism and socioemotional selectivity in later life. The Journals of Gerontology, 59(5), 251-257.

Jones, D. A. (2010). Does serving the community also serve the company? Using organizational identification and social exchange theories to understand employee responses to a volunteerism programme. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83(4), 857-878

Jun, W. W., & Seng, L. C. (2016). The relationship of corporate social responsibility and employee retention. International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management, 4(10), 911-921. Retrieved from http://ijecm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/41053.pdf

Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 24, 163-204.

Lai, M. H., Ren, M. Y., Wu, A. M., & Hung, E. P. (2012). Motivation as mediator between national identity and intention to volunteer. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 23(2), 128-142. doi:10.1002/casp.2108

Lalap, B. A., Dy, M. R., Saguiguit, S. L. C., & Dizon, T. (2013). Adolescent volunteerism and its contributions to social and moral development as perceived by the UPLB Ugnayanng Pahinungod Student Volunteers. Journal of Human Ecology, 1(2).

McGlone, T., Spain, J., & McGlone, V. (2011). Corporate social responsibility and the millennials. Journal of Education for Business, 86(4), 195-200.

Okun, M.A., Barr, A., & Herzog, A.R. (1998). Motivation to volunteer by older adults: A test of competing measurement models. Psychology and Aging, 13, 608–621.

Okun, M.A. & Schultz, A. (2003). Age and motives for volunteering: Testing hypotheses derived from socioemotional selectivity theory. Psychology and Aging, 18(2), 231-239.

Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68(4), 671–686. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.671

Papadakis, K., Griffin, T., & Frater, J. (2004). Understanding volunteers' motivations. Retrieved from https://www.fs.fed.us/ne/newtown

Riecken, G., Babakus, E., & Yavas, U. (1994). Facing resource attraction challenges in the nonprofit sector: A behavioristic approach to fund raising and volunteer recruitment. Journal of Professional Services Marketing, 11(1), 45-70.

Snyder, M., Clary, E. G., & Stukas, A. A. (2000). The functional approach to volunteerism. In G. R. Maio & J. M. Olson (Eds.), Why we evaluate: Functions of attitudes (p. 365–393). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (1999). The Effects of "Mandatory Volunteerism" on Intentions to Volunteer. Psychological Science, 10(1), 59–64. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00107

Szeltner, C. (2012). Talent report: What workers want in 2012. Retrieved from Net Impact website: https://netimpact.org/sites/default/files/documents/what-workers-want-2012.pdf

Widjaja, E. (2010). Motivation behind volunteerism. Retrieved from http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1015&context=cmc_theses

Zedeck, S. (Ed.). (2011). APA handbooks in psychology. APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization. American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/12171-000